REMARKS

At the outset, the courtesies extended by the Examiner in granting the 14 July 2005 interview are appreciatively noted. At the interview, the Su reference cited in the 20 April 2005 Office Action was discussed in light of the further clarifying amendments proposed to the claims by the undersigned attorney, as set forth herein.

While definitive agreement as to the claims was not reached, the Examiner indicated that a formal Response incorporating the proposed claims amendments would be entered. This Response is being filed accordingly.

Responsive to the 20 April 2005 Office Action and the discussions had at the interview, Claims 1, 5, and 7 are now further amended for prosecution with the other pending claims. It is believed that with such amendment of claims, there is a further clarification of their recitations.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1 – 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Su reference. The Examiner essentially maintained the rejection as set forth in the earlier non-final Office Action. The Examiner acknowledged that Su fails to disclose certain features, but concluded that those features would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. In this regard, the Examiner relied in part upon Su's mention of alternate means of detection other than interruption of electrical

conductivity, namely detection of acoustic emissions and disturbed balances of weight.

As each of the newly-amended independent Claims 1, 5, and 7 now further clarify, Applicant's monitoring and sensing system/method includes among its combination of features not only the "sampl[ing]" at each remote detection station of a sensed "biometric signature" of a detected insect, but also the "comparative verification" of that "signature" relative to stored biometrically identifying information characteristic of a particular targeted species. Thus, in addition to continual monitoring for detections of targeted insect candidates, actual "identification" of the detected candidates is also "made with respect to the targeted insect species," as each of the newly-amended independent Claims 1, 5, and 7 also now clarifies.

The cited Su reference fails to disclose the full combination of these and other features now more clearly recited by Applicant's pending claims. The reference's focus is centrally upon quick and immediate indication of any termite infestation. As such, Su nowhere seeks to even distinguish between detection and identification. Su accepts a positive detection of a triggering event (broken circuit, disturbed weight balance, presence of moisture, presence of acoustic emission, for example) as indication of pest intrusion.

This is evident in Su's explicitly disclosed preferred embodiment, wherein detection is indicated by an interruption in electrical conductivity arising from a physical break in its cellulose treated circuit trace. Su accepts a break in this trace to be the result of a termite

having chewed through that circuit trace. Su nowhere discloses nor even suggests any measures for "identification of," a detected candidate/insect to be "made with respect to the targeted insect species" (as each of Applicant's newly-amended independent Claims 1, 5, and 7 clearly recites), much less to any measures for "comparative verification" of a "sensed biometric signature" relative to a stored identifying signature.

It is quite telling that in none other than its centerpiece embodiment, Su prescribes the very vehicle for detection (i.e., the circuit traces) to be immediately destroyed at detection. This quashes any notion that Su somehow motivates, or even contemplates, the sampling of anything through its detectors, let alone the sampling therethrough of a sensed biometric signature for the intruding termite or other destructive pest.

While Su does mention in passing that other possible vehicles for detection (other than circuit interruption) may be used, the primary focus of Su's approach remains immediate detection of some triggering event, be it circuit interruption, moisture variation, weight variation, or even acoustic emission. Discrete detection devices essentially constitute condition-responsive switches, or transducers. Su's passing mention of such various discrete detection devices, even one for detecting an acoustic emission, no more teaches the biometric signature sensing, identifying, and other features recited in Applicant's claims than, say, the mere mention of a discrete photosensor would teach the elaborate electro-optical and processing features involved in an optical character

recognition system, for example.

It is respectfully submitted, therefore, that the cited Su reference fails to disclose the unique combination of elements now more clearly recited by Applicant's pending claims for the purposes and objectives disclosed in the subject Patent Application.

It is now believed that the subject Patent Application has been placed fully in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
For: ROSENBERG, KLEIN & LEE

Jun Y. Lee
Registration #40,262
Dated: 7/15/2005

Suite 101
3458 Ellicott Center Drive
Ellicott City, MD 21043
(410) 465-6678

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this paper is being facsimile transmitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, Art Unit #3643, facsimile number 571-273-8300 on the date shown below.

7/15/2005
Date

Jun Y. Lee

